

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/12/2021 05:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Regional Office of Education #17 (S411C210087)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Sub Total	50	50
Resources & Management Plan		
Resources & Management Plan		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	25
Sub Total	25	25
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
Sub Total	25	0
Priority Questions		
CPP1		
CPP1		
1. CPP1	5	
Sub Total	5	
CPP2		
CPP2		
1. CPP2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
CPP3		
CPP3		
1. CPP3	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	85

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - EIR Early Phase - 2: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Regional Office of Education #17 (S411C210087)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

The Learning While Leading study proposes testing an evidence-based intervention that demonstrated a statistically significant positive impact on student performance in mathematics and reading within a national sample of large school districts in difficult to staff. rural schools in Illinois. The intervention will focus on staffing high need schools with highly effective leaders. (e19)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

2. The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

A comprehensive plan for disseminating implementation results and research findings by capitalizing on our partners' mechanisms for disseminating lessons-learned, best-practices, and results. (e22) Staff will present project design and findings at a variety of forums including state conferences and national conferences through partner networks, including Governor's P-20 Council, monthly superintendent meetings held regionally, and distribution networks from key partners (e23) In addition to use of social media to share project implementation, promote practices and highlight the impact on school leaders/schools, research briefs will target rural, suburban and urban outlets. (e24)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

Strengths:

The proposed study is grounded in research conducted by RAND and reviewed by a What Works Clearinghouse research panel. A comprehensive conceptual framework that includes high-quality professional development for school leaders, on-going, job-embedded coaching, and supports for activities that provided participants with authentic opportunities to lead teachers in instructional improvement efforts (e24-25). A robust body of research is cited in support of the conceptual framework and of the associated activities. (e24-26)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

2. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Strengths:

Applicant specifies four goals and seven strongly aligned objectives outcomes and measures that are clearly specified. Multiple outcomes for each objective contain one or more quantitative targets. For each outcome, multiple data points, instruments or sources are identified. (e28-e29)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

The project has the potential to improve the leadership skills and pedagogical acumen of aspiring and current school leaders. The proposed study engages a consortium of partners to support local school districts in extending the capacity of school leaders to meet the needs of the target population by leveraging expertise in designing and delivering high quality, high impact professional learning targeting the specific needs of Illinois schools. (e29-30)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Resources & Management Plan - Resources & Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Strengths:

The applicant frames a robust management plan with a comprehensive list of milestones and timelines that includes multiple milestones per year and across phases. Milestones aligned to objectives and the year(s) in which each occurs are outlined. (e31-32, e28-29) In addition to overarching project milestones such as hiring personnel, milestones and objectives for school level implementation are provided. Responsibilities of key personnel serving as fiscal agent, regional office of education partners, and external evaluators are described. (e33-34)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

The wide-ranging qualifications and breadth of expertise and experience of the key personnel are relevant and strongly aligned to the goals of the project. (e47-e155) The key personnel have substantial training/experience in grant management, project management, district and school leadership, and professional development. This, in addition to a project director with a record of successfully conducting large federal grants on time and within budget is an important indicator of the capacity of the key personnel to execute the project. (e33)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The costs for personnel, in- and out-of state travel, contracts, supplies, and technology are reasonable and aligned to objectives of the project. (e266-270) Specifically, the project benefits from previous capacity building and material development efforts through prior studies that undergird this proposed study that impacts approximately 25,000 students at an average annual cost of \$25.28 per student. (e35)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

4. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

An overarching process for ensuring feedback from stakeholders and a focus on continuous improvement is outlined. Specifically, a continuous improvement process feedback loop that leverages multiple teams (PD design team, project advisory committee, and regional advisory committee) to strategically monitor data and feedback at regular intervals, with some data review monthly and other data sets reviewed annually. (e253) Project directors will meet weekly with staff to monitor fidelity of implementation and address challenges and barriers (e37)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Sub

- 3. (3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increase knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

CPP1 - CPP1

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).**
Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

CPP2 - CPP2

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).**
Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through...[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

Strengths:

The proposed study will focus collaboration among aspiring principals on fully understanding student learning gaps and developing responsive strategies to accelerate learning in response to the pandemic-induced disruption in schooling. (e21) Aspiring principals will engage in cycles of inquiry processes to address unfinished teaching and learning for underserved students in high-need, difficult to staff schools. Teacher teams engage in meaningful and targeted instructional improvement efforts (e210-211) Teacher teams collaborate in 9 areas including examining various student performance data, engaging in peer supported implementation of a new instructional practice, and exploring current instructional data to determine the extent to which research-based instructional practices are present in classrooms, and engage in action research focused on accelerating learning in response to challenges precipitated by the COVID-19 pandemic (e211).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

CPP3 - CPP3

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).

Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following...[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]

Strengths:

The proposed study integrates a Leadership for Equity (LFE) Micro-Credential (MC) program for new principals during their first year of service. Advanced micro-credentials, requiring five credentials in total, allow the leader to establish core equity competencies such as equity mindset and assessing school culture for equity, and to specialize in other areas of equity such as culturally responsive personnel decisions and increasing family-school connections to reduce disparities. (e211-212) Seven equity commitments, requiring shifts in mindset and practice, are central to the design and are supported with research indicators for each (e213-214)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/12/2021 05:04 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/12/2021 11:07 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Regional Office of Education #17 (S411C210087)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Sub Total	50	50
Resources & Management Plan		
Resources & Management Plan		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	25
Sub Total	25	25
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
Sub Total	25	0
Priority Questions		
CPP1		
CPP1		
1. CPP1	5	
Sub Total	5	
CPP2		
CPP2		
1. CPP2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
CPP3		
CPP3		
1. CPP3	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	85

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - EIR Early Phase - 2: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Regional Office of Education #17 (S411C210087)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

The plan described by the applicant to involve the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies is adequate. Proposed project will encompass the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies by providing documented interventions, resources, activities, services, programs and practices that can help to improve principal retention rates and solve the persistent problems in education that prevent students, particularly high-need students, from succeeding. The project will address the goal (Preparing a group of aspiring principals that effectively engage teachers in action research that demonstrate impact on student learning); and demonstrate how their proposed project which is based on best available evidence and previous existing strategies will increase the number of highly effective principals who positively impact student achievement. Proposed project will modify, transfer, and/or redesign strategies for the target population; expand access and participation in pre-service training and coaching; and equip principals with quality school leadership skills that will improve student achievement by utilizing the (LWL Model). (pages e 15,e19)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

2. The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

The plan described by the applicant in which the results of the proposed project to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies is clear. Potential dissemination of the proposed innovations will increase efficiency, understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies by utilizing resources; replication operations; up-to-date and research-based methods of assessment; adaptations of practices; as well as a clear description of how the grant activities will be implemented. Proposed project will provide community

Sub

awareness of the project, provide nonparticipants with information about the project outcomes (Improved school climate) by utilizing state and national conferences; regional meetings and networks; research briefs, etc. and by providing information on project effectiveness to accelerate achievement; to implement strategies in a variety of new populations and settings; and by enabling others to utilize information or strategies.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

Strengths:

The proposed project’s conceptual framework is well-conceived and will likely lead to sound project implementation by employing strong alignment between the proposed project activities and outcomes outlined in the logic model provided. Their strategic revisions to improve and adjust services; as well as activities will achieve the proposed outcomes and their goal. Additionally, specific tasks that will be completed, the primary participants that will be involved, the methods that will be employed, and the tangible results that are expected for identified tasks are logically linked to a rationale for the implementation strategy and referenced literature by RAND (2014) to validate their proposed design. The detailed project plan provided in the applicant’s proposal will lead to a more organized project implementation by itemizing project tasks, (pre-service training and coaching that supports aspiring leaders in successfully completing action research; placement and induction support); assigning task owners (Project staff); outlining timelines for specific project deliverables (Integration of micro-credentials in equity and English Learners) , and allowing all stakeholders to monitor progress in real time to meet the objectives of the proposed project . (pages e 15, e24, e188)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

2. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Strengths:

The applicant presents realistic activity objectives in measurable terms that include baselines, indicators, targets, timelines, population. Specified measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes will be achieved by utilizing ongoing curriculum adjustments; initiating training modalities based on formative and summative evaluations; and aligning the proposed implementation plan and the performance indicators with proposed activities. The overall rate of change anticipated across the project period and aligned objectives will be determined by rates of increase from

Sub

performance indicators. Project objectives such as, (Aspiring school leaders will be selected from a rigorous recruitment and selection process to participate in the project.) are outlined and include corresponding program purpose. The proposed objectives with clear outcomes or projections such as (100% aspiring leaders will be selected for participation through a rigorous process involving input from the ROE and District partners (Years 1-2) describe the specific desired results of programmatic operations and will be achieved by implementing measurable measuring tools, quantitative qualitative levels of success, forthcoming baselines, indicators, targets (80%), timelines(Years 2-3), and population to achieve measurable goals of the project. (pages e15, e28)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

The application addresses components of the needs of the target population. The application noted that the project will address the challenge of filling leadership vacancies in hard-to-staff schools with highly effective leaders. LWL will serve approximately 25,000 students, of which 51% will be located in rural areas that are disproportionately underserved by these types of innovative projects. The remainder of participants will come from high-need schools in medium or large districts. Linkages with other appropriate agencies and organizations providing services to the target population will be established through project partners: Regional Offices of Education #1, 19, 21, 28, and 50; WestEd, Illinois State University Center for the Study of Education Policy; Illinois State Board of Education, and the Association of Illinois Rural and Small Schools to support the project. Disparities such as school climate issues; attendance, ELA & Math, SEL problems; lack of of principals serving a concentration of high-need students; principal retention rates issues; and lack of well-prepared aspiring leaders in pipeline for hard-to-staff schools will be addressed by: pre-service training and coaching that supports aspiring leaders in successfully completing action research; placement and induction support, and on-going job embedded professional development during the in-service phase as a new principal, etc. to meet the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (page e15)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Resources & Management Plan - Resources & Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Strengths:

The management plan described by the applicant is adequate to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. The management plan will achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks by incorporating a detailed timeline (Spring 1) that provides a clear roadmap for project implementation by positioning key benchmarks with objectives, outputs, and outcomes (Improved principal retention rates) outlined in the logic model; and highlighting specific deliverables from all key partners and stakeholders involved in the project. Project milestones (Student assessments) will drive continuous improvement by addressing data checkpoints where information collected is analyzed and used to identify areas where pivots in strategy of implementation may be warranted. Clearly defined roles for key personnel and sufficient staff time (50%) will accomplish project tasks by improving results and productivity. The proposed budget appears to be consistent with the size and scope of the project in order to provide proposed services, and achieve the activities and goals of the proposal with the total amount of money requested. The key personnel (Co-Directors) assigned to the proposed project stem from multiple departments within the organization, which will provide an opportunity for the project to have a systemic impact on the organization's overall operation to maximize the effectiveness of the project. (pages e15, e31)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

The qualifications of the key project personnel are clearly appropriate to the respective positions. Qualified key project personnel with relevant training and experience will improve productivity and accomplish project tasks by employing their expertise in leadership, evaluation, curriculum development, and management skills. Additionally, key personnel are appropriate to their respective positions and qualified to carry out the proposed project; have the programmatic capability to serve the target population; will provide assurances that the project has the capacity to meet program goal by providing proper and effective administration of the proposed project. Qualifications (included in resume) :training and education of the Co-Director/ Principal Investigator on EIR (Ph.D.) in a relevant field; consultant, leadership and evaluation, and grant writing skills, will provide administration services to effectively fulfill the objectives of the project; maximize the effectiveness of the project, and provide oversight to justify assurances that the project has the capacity to achieve the objectives on time. (page e 48)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant has provided relevant information regarding how costs are appropriate and reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. The costs will reflect their work plan,

Sub

objectives, and detailed computations of personnel salaries, fringe benefits, travel (\$9,000.00 per year) and supplies by utilizing a budget justification that details cost basis, calculations; and demonstrates how each line-item expenditure was derived. The budget delineates costs of the project to be met by the funding source. The individual line items (e.g., personnel (\$87,337.00 Year 1), travel, materials, etc.) are understandable in terms of what they will cost and what services will be rendered for the proposed project. Items are logically linked to the activities in the proposed project and are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. The total proposed budget appears to be consistent with the size and scope of the project in order to accomplish the activities and goals of the proposal with the total amount of money requested. (page e 281)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant has provided effective procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. Proposed procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvements will operate in the proposed project by employing the effective intervals and timeline (twice a year) for gathering and analyzing project data; allowing meaningful assessment of progress to occur in time for course corrections to be made; implementing a data analysis mechanism for assessing project implementation; remediation and ongoing communication strategies; providing ongoing multiple assessments (Comprehensive Assessment of Leadership for Learning (CALL) and student-level Illinois Assessment of Readiness standardized tests), monitoring of components and analysis and dissemination of data to facilitate improvement and sustainability of effective strategies. A process to collect data from all LWL participants and partners in Year 2; and feedback from staff and partnering schools is addressed to evaluate and to ensure feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. (page e 40)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).

Sub

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increase knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

CPP1 - CPP1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).**
Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

CPP2 - CPP2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).

Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through...[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

Strengths:

The applicant will address the impact of COVID-19 on underserved students and educators by providing participating principals with research-based training and on-site support for facilitating collaboration within teacher teams focused on fully understanding student learning gaps and developing responsive strategies that improve instruction and accelerate learning. LWL will also integrate this work in three ways: 1) providing training to all LWL aspiring principals with our Unfinished Teaching and Learning: Gap Identification module and resources; 2) providing training and support for participants to conduct Cycles of Inquiry; and 3) supporting completion of an action project that LWL participants conduct with a teacher team, applying COI process to address an identified learning gap in ELA or Math as a result of COVID-19 to address the needs of educators most impacted by COVID-19. (page e21)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

CPP3 - CPP3

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).

Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following...[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]

Strengths:

The applicant addresses factors to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12. The applicant stated that Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities and improving the quality of educational programs will be addressed by offering the aspiring/new leaders an opportunity to complete the Leaders for Equity Microcredentials In the implementation phases, coaches will receive just-in-time training and support from project staff to ensure they are equipped to support their aspiring/new leaders to carry out project intervention strategies to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12.(page e259)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/12/2021 11:07 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/12/2021 09:17 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Regional Office of Education #17 (S411C210087)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	0
Sub Total	50	0
Resources & Management Plan		
Resources & Management Plan		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	0
Sub Total	25	0
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	25
Sub Total	25	25
Priority Questions		
CPP1		
CPP1		
1. CPP1	5	
Sub Total	5	
CPP2		
CPP2		
1. CPP2	5	
Sub Total	5	
CPP3		
CPP3		
1. CPP3	5	
Sub Total	5	
Total	115	25

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - EIR Early Phase - 2: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Regional Office of Education #17 (S411C210087)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

2. The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

- 1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

- 2. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

- 3. The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Resources & Management Plan - Resources & Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

- 1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Sub

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

- 2. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

- 3. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

- 4. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

- 1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).**

Strengths:

The proposed project's methods of evaluation, if well implemented, will produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse evidence with reservations. The proposed evaluation is a quasi-experimental design with eligible and reliable outcome measures (e41). The proposed methods address baseline equivalence among groups and provide detailed analysis methods (e41, e257). Missing data will also be handled appropriately (e258).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

- 2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

Strengths:

The proposed project incorporates research questions to provide performance and implementation feedback on a regular basis (e42). Progress towards intended outcomes are monitored using qualitative and quantitative data using mixed methods (e42-43).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

- 3. (3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increase knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.**

Strengths:

The proposed project will contribute to increased knowledge and effective strategies around professional learning models. The authors report the limited number of studies in this area that meet What Works Clearinghouse standards and this study will add to those numbers (e43).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

CPP1 - CPP1

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).
Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area:**

Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

CPP2 - CPP2

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).**

Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through...[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

CPP3 - CPP3

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).**

Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following...[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/12/2021 09:17 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/11/2021 05:08 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Regional Office of Education #17 (S411C210087)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	0
Sub Total	50	0
Resources & Management Plan		
Resources & Management Plan		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	0
Sub Total	25	0
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	25
Sub Total	25	25
Priority Questions		
CPP1		
CPP1		
1. CPP1	5	
Sub Total	5	
CPP2		
CPP2		
1. CPP2	5	
Sub Total	5	
CPP3		
CPP3		
1. CPP3	5	
Sub Total	5	
Total	115	25

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - EIR Early Phase - 2: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Regional Office of Education #17 (S411C210087)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

2. The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

- 1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

- 2. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

- 3. The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Resources & Management Plan - Resources & Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

- 1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Sub

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

- 2. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

- 3. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

- 4. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).

Strengths:

The investigators propose an evaluation plan that if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook. Investigators present relevant and key research questions that will be addressed by the methods and research design. Their study proposes using a Comparative Interruptive Time Series (CITS) design with comparison group design with a sufficiently large sample size to conduct a powerful study that will result in reliable answers to the research questions, preventing type I and II errors. (Page e40). Power analysis and analytical assumptions were provided in Appendix S.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Strengths:

Investigators provided adequate and detailed information that highlights their plan for providing performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes on pages e42-e43 and Appendix R. Specifically, the project intends to use an iterative continuous improvement process (CIP) to modify project processes and programming according to various feedback loops over the life of grant utilizing the Plan-Do-Study-Act approach to program improvements. Another strength includes de participation of WestEd as the external evaluator for this project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increase knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

Strengths:

The proposed project has great potential to contributing to the much-needed understanding of the components, cost, and effects of new principal support services that "bridge" pre- and in-service career phases.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

CPP1 - CPP1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).

Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

CPP2 - CPP2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).

Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through...[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

CPP3 - CPP3

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).

Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following...[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/11/2021 05:08 PM